OIPE
AUG 22 2003
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

#10 Appeal Brief Wolder 9.25.03

DOCKET NO: EJOU0010U/US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF:
Joel F. PLOTKIN

: GROUP: 3629

APPLICATION NUMBER: 09/513,960 : EXAMINER: BORISSOV Igor

FILED: February 28, 2000

FOR: A PROCESS FOR COMPUTER IMPLEMENTED MANUSCRIPT REVIEW

37 CFR 1.192 APPEAL BRIEF

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

Sir: In response to the final office action mailed May 07, 2003, the applicants appeal.

08/25/2003 SSITHIB1 00000068 09513960
01 FC:1402 320.00 OP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. **37 CFR 1.192(a)** 1

II. **37 CFR 1.192(b)** 1

III. **37 CFR 1.192(c)** 1

A. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(1) - Real Party in Interest** 1

B. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(2) - Related Appeals and Interferences** 1

C. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(3) - Status of Claims** 1

D. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(4) - Status of Amendments** 1

E. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(5) - Summary of the Claimed Inventions** 1

F. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(6) - Issues** 2

G. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) - Grouping of Claims** 2

H. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(8) - Argument** 2

1. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)(iv) - 35 USC 103** 2

a. **Claim 1** 4

b. **Claim 2** 5

c. **Claim 4** 6

d. **Claim 5** 6

e. **Claim 8** 7

f. **Claim 9** 7

g. **Claim 26** 8

h. **Claim 27** 8

i. **Claim 28** 9

j. **Claim 29** 9

k. **Claim 30** 10

l. **Claim 31** 11

m. **Claim 32** 11

n. **Claim 33** 12

o. **Claim 34** 12

I. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(9) - Appendix** 13

IV. **37 CFR 1.192(d) - Non-compliant Brief** 13

V. **Appendix I - 37 CFR 1.192(c)(9) Claims Under Appeal** 14

OIPE JC184
AUG 22 2003
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

I. **37 CFR 1.192(a)**

This brief is filed in triplicate, is accompanied by the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c), and sets forth the authorities and arguments on which the appellant will rely to maintain the appeal.

II. **37 CFR 1.192(b)**

The filing is timely. Accordingly, this subsection is not relevant.

III. **37 CFR 1.192(c)**

A. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(1) - Real Party in Interest**

The real party in interest is Precision Computer Works, Inc. a Maryland Corporation.

B. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(2) - Related Appeals and Interferences**

There are no related Appeals or Interferences.

C. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(3) - Status of Claims**

Claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-34 are pending and under appeal. Claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-24 stand rejected. Claims 25-34 are newly presented and presumed to be rejected on the same basis as claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-24 for the purposes of this appeal.

D. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(4) - Status of Amendments**

An amendment was submitted with this appeal brief. However, since the application is not under final status, that amendment should now be entered. The amendment presents claims 25-34.

E. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(5) - Summary of the Claimed Inventions**

The claimed inventions provide a computer implemented manuscript review and determination process, system (claims 1 and 11) and computer program product (claim 20) for receiving manuscript data defining a manuscript including at least one of text data, audio data, and video data (page 4 lines 17-22 and page 6 lines 8-9); prompting a potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript (page 5 lines 14-17); storing agreement data received from said potential reviewer, said agreement data including at least one of agreement to review and disagreement to review said manuscript (page 5 lines 21-25); and storing a decision whether to publish (page 7 lines 21-24). Support for claims 25-34 is specified in the amendment filed with this brief.

F. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(6) - Issues**

Whether the rejections of claims 1-2, 4-12 and 14-24 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plantz et al. (US 6,088,702) ("Plantz") in view of Hager et al. (US 5,377,355) ("Hager") and Price et al. (Peering into Peer Review; Publication) ("Publication") should be reversed.

Whether new claims 25-34 are allowable.

G. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) - Grouping of Claims**

The claims do not stand or fall together. The claims are grouped as follows:

Group 1 - Claims 1, 6, and 7, and 11, 16, and 17, and 20, and 25.

Group 2 - Claim 2 and 12

Group 3 - Claim 4 and 14

Group 4 - Claim 5 and 15

Group 5 - Claims 8 and 9, and 18 and 19

Group 6 - Claim 10.

Group 7 - Claim 26

Group 8 - Claim 27

Group 9 - Claim 28

Group 10 - Claim 29

Group 11 - Claim 30

Group 12 - Claim 31

Group 13 - Claim 32

Group 14 - Claim 33

Group 15 - Claim 34

Different reasons for patentability relating to an exemplary claim of each group are presented below.

H. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(8) - Argument**

1. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)(iv) - 35 USC 103**

The examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-12 and 14-24 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plantz et al. (US 6,088,702) in view of Hager et al. (US 5,377,355) and Price

et al. ("Peering into Peer Review"; (Publication)), stating that:

Plantz et al. teach a method and system for permitting coordinated publishing, assembly and administration of texts by an unlimited number of authors or editors, comprising:

As per claims 1-2, 11-12 and 20-22,

- receiving manuscript data defining a manuscript comprising at least one of text data, audio data, and video data (column 7, lines 37-43, 58-63; column 8, lines 20-27; column 9, lines 24-31);

- prompting a potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript (column 8, lines 20-30);

- storing agreement data received from said potential reviewer (column 8, lines 20-30, 59-67; column 10, lines 1-13).

- transmitting a signal prompting an additional potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript based on stored agreement data from at least one potential reviewer (column 8, lines 59-67).

Plantz et al. does not specifically teach for storing a decision whether to publish, and transmitting said signal if said potential reviewer disagrees to review said manuscript.

Hager et al. teach a method and system for automatically initiating additional procedures with regard to a document, wherein evaluators vote to publish the document, and a decision whether to publish is stored (Abstract; column 2, lines 39-53; column 7, lines 20-21; column 7, line 48 through column 8, line 1; column 8, lines 44-51; column 9, lines 48-57).

Publication, which appears to be published on December 1995, discloses a current practice of reviewing manuscript (see pages 1 and 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Plantz et al. to include that the decision whether to publish can be stored because it would enhance the performance of the system thereby making it more attractive to customers.

As per claims 4-5 and 14-15, Plantz et al. teach said method and system, comprising:

- storing data indicating an identification of an associate editor for said manuscript in association with said manuscript data (column 10, lines 8-36);

- storing at least one date on which said associate editor assigns a potential reviewer (column 10, lines 12-14).

As per claims 6 and 16, Plantz et al. teach said method and system, comprising:

- storing a data on which at least one of receiving said manuscript, prompting a potential reviewer, and receiving agreement data occurs (column 10, lines 12-14, 46-62).

As per claims 7-8 and 17-18, Plantz et al. teach said method and system, comprising:

- authorizing transmission of said manuscript to at least one of associate editors, potential reviewers and reviewers of said manuscript (column 10, lines 46-62).

As per claims 9-10 and 19, Plantz et al. teach said method and system, wherein said authorizing transmission comprises storing, in association with said unique identification, an identification of an associate editor and a reviewer (column 10, lines 30-62).

As per claim 23, Plantz et al. and publication teach tracking said manuscript and storing said tracking information in a database (column 6, line 66 through column 7, line 2; column 11, lines 14-21,31-33).

Hager et al. teach said method and system wherein it is determined whether evaluator

votes have been received with regard to a particular document, and a prompting message may be utilized to induce an evaluator to submit a vote for the document if the evaluator has not done so within a preselected period of time (column 9, lines 27-37).

As per claim 24, Hager et al. teach said method and system wherein said final decision for publishing is made by a majority tallying of the individual review, if all reviewers indicate said manuscript should be published, said manuscript is automatically sent to printing queue or printing facility (Abstract; column 2, lines 39-53; column 7, lines 20-21; column 7, line 48 through column 8, line 1; column 8, lines 44-51; column 9, lines 48-57). [Office Action mailed on May 07, 2003 page 2 line 13 through page 5 line 8.]

In reply, generally speaking, the applicants submit that these rejections should be reversed because they are not supported by any substantial evidence and fail to carry the burdens of proof and persuasion. Reasoning supporting these conclusions is presented below.

a. **Claim 1**

Claim 1 recites:

1. A computer implemented manuscript review and determination process, comprising:

receiving manuscript data defining a manuscript including at least one of text data, audio data, and video data;

prompting a potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript;

storing agreement data received from said potential reviewer, said agreement data including at least one of agreement to review and disagreement to review said manuscript; and

storing a decision whether to publish.

The examiner admits that Plantz does not disclose or suggest "storing a decision whether to publish." Office action mailed May 07, 2003 page 3 lines 6-8. The examiner does not clearly identify which of Hager and Publication he relies to suggest modifying Plantz to include "storing a decision whether to publish." See office action mailed May 07, 2003 page 3 lines 9-16 (characterizing the teachings of Hager and Publication) and page 3 lines 17-21 (alleging motivation to modify Plantz to include inter alia storing a decision whether to publish). The examiner does allege at office action mailed May 07, 2003 page 3 lines 11-13 that Hager discloses storing a decision whether to publish. However, I have carefully reviewed the passages of Hager relied upon by the examiner in his assertion that Hager discloses storing a decision whether to publish (office action mailed May 07, 2003 at page 3 lines 11-13 cites Hager abstract, column 2 lines 39-53, column 7 lines 20-21, column 7 line 48 to column 8 line 1, column 8 lines

44-51, and column 9 lines 48-57), and I disagree with the examiner. In fact, Hager does not disclose storing a decision whether to publish. Thus, Hager does not disclose, and therefore cannot suggest modification of Plantz to include, "storing a decision whether to publish," as recited by claim 1.

Publication contains no disclosure related to storing decisions whether to publish a manuscript.

Moreover, Plantz also does not disclose a "A computer implemented manuscript review and determination process." Instead, Plantz discloses a document generation process in which multiple people work collaboratively, in sequence, to build a document. Generally see the Abstract. Thus, Plantz has nothing to do with manuscript review and decisions regarding publishing. Hager, on the other hand, is directed to evaluating documents, specifically invention disclosures. Since the purpose for Plantz's and Hager's process are unrelated, they provide no motivation to modify one in view of the other.

In view of the foregoing, I believe that the rejection of claim 1 is improper because (1) there is no teaching of a manuscript review and determination process storing a decision whether to publish and (2) Plantz and Hager are not logically combinable. Accordingly, the rejections of claim 1 are improper and should be reversed.

b. **Claim 2**

Claim 2 recites:

2. The computer implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising transmitting a signal prompting an additional potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript based on stored agreement data from at least one potential reviewer.

The examiner relies upon the combination of Plantz and Hager to suggest modifying Plantz's system to include " prompting an additional potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript based on stored agreement data from at least one potential reviewer." However, Plantz is not directed to review of manuscripts. Therefore, there is no motivation for the proposed combination. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 2 is improper and should be reversed.

c. **Claim 4**

Claim 4 recites:

4. The computer implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising storing data indicating an identification of an associate editor for said manuscript in association with said manuscript data.

The examiner argues that Plantz column 10 lines 8-36 teaches storing data indicating identification of an associate editor for a manuscript. Office action mailed May 7, 2003 page 4 lines 3-4. That is incorrect. Plantz column 10 lines 8-36 discloses that there may be multiple editors; it does not disclose identification of an associate editor.

An "associate editor" is a term clearly and expressly defined in the specification of this application. Specification page 5 lines 18-22 defines an associate editor as an "editor that normally reports to an editor of the publication." Plantz does not disclose storing data identifying editors that normally report to the editor of the publication.

Specification paragraph spanning pages 6 and 7 discloses that an *editor* defines a user of a computer system with rights to (1) assign monitoring/associate editors (referred to as elements 104, 105, 106 in the first figure), (2) assign reviewers, (3) to approve or deny publication, (4) view the document, and (5) get status information, whereas the specification discloses that an *associate editor* only has rights (2)-(5). Accordingly, the specification clearly defines an *associate editor* as one having less computer access rights than an editor. Plantz does not disclose such a concept. Therefore, to the extent that Plantz's discloses multiple editors, that disclosure fails to suggest "storing data indicating an identification of an associate editor," as recited by claim 4. Therefore, claim 4 defines subject matter non-obvious in view of Platz. None of the other applied references suggests this concept. Therefore, the rejection of claim 4 is improper and should be reversed.

d. **Claim 5**

Claim 5 recites:

5. The computer implemented method according to claim 4, further comprising storing at least one date on which said associate editor performs at least one of assigning a potential

reviewer and entering manuscript approval status data.

Since Plantz does not disclose or suggest "storing data indicating an identification of an associate editor," as explained for claim 4, Plantz cannot suggest the "date on which said associate editor performs" some action, as defined by claim 5. For this additional reason, the rejection of claim 5 is improper and should be reversed.

e. **Claim 8**

8. (previously presented) The computer implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising authorizing transmission of said manuscript to at least one of associate editors of said manuscript, potential reviewers of said manuscript, and reviewers of said manuscript.

For the reasons stated for claim 1, the applied prior art does not disclose defining associate editors. For at least this reason, claim 8 is non-obvious.

Moreover, the prior art does not address security issues. Therefore, it does not teach the step of "'authorizing transmission" defined by claim 8. In that respect, this application defines authorization rights and limitations at page 6 center paragraph and the paragraph spanning pages 6 and 7. For this additional reason, the rejection of claim 8 should be reversed.

f. **Claim 9**

Claim 9 recites:

9. (previously presented) The computer implemented method according to claim 8, wherein said authorizing transmission comprises storing, in association with said unique identification, at least one of an identification of an associate editor, a potential reviewer, and a reviewer.

For the reasons stated for claim 8, the applied prior art does not disclose "authorizing transmission."

For the reasons stated for claim 4, the applied prior art does not disclose storing "identification of an associate editor."

For both of these reasons, the rejection of claim 9 is improper and should be reversed.

g. **Claim 26**

Claim 26 recites:

26. The process of claim 1 wherein receiving manuscript data comprises receiving at a central computer manuscript data defining a completed manuscript transmitted from a remote terminal associated with an author; and

said prompting a potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript comprises transmitting prompt data to a remote terminal associated with said potential reviewer after receiving manuscript data defining a completed manuscript.

Claim 26 should be allowed for the reason stated for claim 1.

Moreover, Plantz discloses a collaborative publishing system. Plantz does not disclose "receiving ... data defining a completed manuscript transmitted from a remote terminal associated with an author" and then "transmitting prompt data to a remote terminal associated with said potential reviewer *after* receiving manuscript data defining a completed manuscript." None of the applied prior art suggests these concepts. For these additional reasons, claim 26 should be allowed.

h. **Claim 27**

Claim 27 recites:

27. (new): The process of claim 1 wherein receiving manuscript data comprises receiving at a central computer manuscript data defining a completed manuscript transmitted from a remote terminal associated with an author; and

in response to receiving said completed manuscript at said central computer automatically prompting a potential reviewer for agreement to review said completed manuscript.

Claim 27 should be allowed for the reason stated for claim 1.

Moreover, Plantz discloses a collaborative publishing system. Plantz does not disclose "receiving at a central computer manuscript data defining a completed manuscript transmitted from a remote terminal associated with an author" or "in response to receiving said completed

manuscript at said central computer automatically prompting a potential reviewer for agreement to review said completed manuscript." The other references fail to teach these limitations. For this additional reason, claim 27 should be allowed.

i. **Claim 28**

Claim 28 recites:

28. (new): The process of claim 1 wherein receiving manuscript data comprises receiving at a central computer manuscript data defining a completed manuscript transmitted from a remote terminal associated with an author; and

in response to receiving at said central computer system a signal indicating that a first potential reviewer disagrees to review said manuscript, generating at said central computer and transmitting to a second potential reviewer at a remote terminal a request prompting said second potential reviewer to review said complete manuscript.

Claim 28 should be allowed for the reason stated for claim 1.

Moreover, Plantz discloses a collaborative publishing system. Plantz does not disclose "receiving at a central computer manuscript data defining a completed manuscript transmitted from a remote terminal associated with an author" or in response to receiving at said central computer system a signal indicating that a first potential reviewer disagrees to review said manuscript, generating at said central computer and transmitting to a second potential reviewer at a remote terminal a request prompting said second potential reviewer to review said complete manuscript. " The other references fail to teach these limitations. Therefore, claim 28 should be allowed.

j. **Claim 29**

Claim 29 recites:

29. (new): The process of claim 1 further comprising storing data indicating an identification of a first associate editor for said manuscript in association with said manuscript data and an identification of an editor, wherein said editor has rights to assign at least one second associate editor for said manuscript and said first associate editor does not have rights to assign

any associate editor for said manuscript.

For the reasons explained for claim 4, the prior art does not disclose or suggest storing date defining an associate editor. Claim 29 expressly defines storing "data indicating an identification of a first associate editor for said manuscript in association with said manuscript data and an identity of an editor" and therefore is allowable for the reasons stated for claims 1 and 4.

Moreover, claim 29 expressly defines a specific difference in rights between the editor and the associate editor, reciting "wherein said editor has rights to assign at least one second associate editor for said manuscript and said first associate editor does not have rights to assign any associate editor for said manuscript."

k. **Claim 30**

Claim 30 recites:

30. (new): The process of claim 1, further comprising:

storing data indicating an identification of a first associate editor for said manuscript in association with said manuscript data;

storing data indicating an identity of an editor;

wherein said associate editor has less rights relating to said manuscript than said editor.

For the reasons explained for claim 4, the prior art does not disclose or suggest storing date defining an associate editor. Claim 30 expressly defines "storing data indicating an identification of a first associate editor for said manuscript in association with said manuscript data; [and] storing data indicating an identity of an editor" and therefore is allowable for the reasons stated for claims 1 and 4.

Moreover, claim 30 expressly defines a specific difference in rights between the editor and the associate editor, defining lesser rights for the associate editor, reciting "wherein said associate editor has less rights relating to said manuscript than said editor." None of the applied prior art suggests these concepts.

For this additional reason, claim 30 is allowable.

l. **Claim 31**

Claim 31 recites:

31. (new): A computer implemented manuscript review and determination process, comprising:

receiving at a central computer manuscript data from a remote terminal associated with an author, said manuscript data defining a complete manuscript including at least one of text data, audio data, and video data;

generating at said central computer a request to review prompt for prompting a potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript;

transmitting said request to review prompt to a remote terminal associated with said potential reviewer;

storing in a database controlled by said central computer agreement data received from said potential reviewer at said central computer, said agreement data including at least one of agreement to review and disagreement to review said manuscript; and

storing a decision whether to publish said manuscript.

Claim 31 is non-obvious for the reasons stated for claim 1.

Moreover, Plantz does not disclose " receiving at a central computer manuscript data from a remote terminal associated with an author, said manuscript data defining a complete manuscript including at least one of text data, audio data, and video data." None of the applied prior art suggests these concepts. For this additional reason, claim 31 is allowable.

m. **Claim 32**

Claim 32 recites:

32. The method of 31 further comprising storing at said central computer different rights relating to a manuscript for users defined as author, editor, associate editor, and reviewer.

Claim 32 is allowable for the reasons stated for claim 31.

Moreover, the prior art relied upon does not disclose or suggest "storing at said central

computer different rights relating to a manuscript for users defined as author, editor, associate editor, and reviewer." For this additional reason, claim 32 is allowable.

n. **Claim 33**

Claim 33 recites:

33. The method of claim 32 further comprising configuring said central computer wherein a user defined as an author of said manuscript has rights to get status information relating to said manuscript, a user defined as an editor has rights to assign associate editors to said manuscript, assign reviewers to said manuscript, view, authorize publication, and get status information for said manuscript, a user defined as an associate editor for said manuscript has rights to assign reviewers to said manuscript, view, authorize publication, and get status information for said manuscript and does not have rights to assign additional associate editors to said manuscript, a user defined as a reviewer of a manuscript has rights to indicate whether said manuscript should be published, and get status information on said manuscript.

Claim 33 is allowable for the reasons stated for claim 32.

Moreover, the prior art relied upon does not disclose the specific different rights defined by user classes of author, editor, associate editor, and reviewer defined by claim 32. For this additional reason, claim 32 is allowable.

o. **Claim 34**

35. The method of claim 31 further comprising storing at said central computer different rights relating to a manuscript for users defined as author editor, associate editor, reviewer, and staff member.

Claim 34 is allowable for the reasons stated for claim 31.

Moreover, the prior art relied upon in the rejections does not disclose or suggest "storing at said central computer different rights relating to a manuscript for users defined as author editor, associate editor, reviewer, and staff member." For this additional reason, claim 34 is allowable.

I. **37 CFR 1.192(c)(9) - Appendix**

Appendix I contains a clean copy of claims 1-34 under appeal.

IV. **37 CFR 1.192(d) - Non-compliant Brief**

This brief is in compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c). Accordingly, this subsection is inapplicable.

31518
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

8/22/03
Date

Respectfully Submitted,

Richard A. Neifeld, Ph.D.
Registration No. 35,299
Attorney of Record

V. Appendix I - 37 CFR 1.192(c)(9) Claims Under Appeal

Claims 1-34 are pending and subject to this appeal.

1. (currently amended) A computer implemented manuscript review and determination process, comprising:

receiving manuscript data defining a manuscript including at least one of text data, audio data, and video data;

prompting a potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript;

storing agreement data received from said potential reviewer, said agreement data including at least one of agreement to review and disagreement to review said manuscript; and

storing a decision whether to publish.

2. (previously presented) The computer implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising transmitting a signal prompting an additional potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript based on stored agreement data from at least one potential reviewer.

3. (canceled)

4. (previously presented) The computer implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising storing data indicating an identification of an associate editor for said manuscript in association with said manuscript data.

5. (currently amended) The computer implemented method according to ~~claim 1~~ claim 4, further comprising storing at least one date on which said associate editor performs at least one of assigning a potential reviewer and entering manuscript approval status data.

6. (previously presented) The computer implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising storing a date on which at least one of receiving said manuscript, prompting a potential reviewer, and receiving agreement data occurs.

7. (previously presented) The computer implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising transmitting a manuscript review instruction to reviewer.

8. (previously presented) The computer implemented method according to claim 1, further comprising authorizing transmission of said manuscript to at least one of associate editors of said manuscript, potential reviewers of said manuscript, and reviewers of said manuscript.

9. (previously presented) The computer implemented method according to claim 8, wherein said authorizing transmission comprises storing, in association with said unique identification, at least one of an identification of an associate editor, a potential reviewer, and a reviewer.

10. (previously presented) The computer implemented method according to claim 8, wherein said authorizing transmission comprises storing, in association with said unique identification, an identification of an associate editor and a reviewer.

11. (currently amended) A computer implemented manuscript review and determination system, comprising:

means for receiving manuscript data defining a manuscript including at least one of text data, audio data, and video data;

means for prompting a potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript;

means for storing agreement data received from said potential reviewer, said agreement data including at least one of agreement to review and disagreement to review said manuscript; and

means for storing a decision whether to publish.

12. (previously presented) The computer implemented system according to claim 11, further comprising means for transmitting a signal prompting an additional potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript.

13. (Canceled)

14. (previously presented) The computer implemented system according to claim 11, further comprising means for storing data indicating an identification of an associate editor for said manuscript in association with said manuscript data.

15. (currently amended) The computer implemented system according to claim 14, further comprising means for storing at least one date on which said associate editor preforms at least one of assigning a potential reviewer and entering manuscript approval status data.

16. (previously presented) The computer implemented system according to claim 11, further comprising means for storing a date on which at least one of receiving said manuscript, prompting a potential reviewer, and receiving agreement data occurs.

17. (previously presented) The computer implemented system according to claim 11, further comprising means for transmitting a manuscript review instruction to a reviewer.

18. (previously presented) The computer implemented system according to claim 11, further comprising means for authorizing transmission of said manuscript to at least one of associate editors of said manuscript, potential reviewers of said manuscript, and reviewers of said manuscript.

19. (previously presented) The computer implemented system according to claim 18, wherein means for authorizing comprises means for storing, in association with said unique identification , at least one of an identification of an associate editor, a potential reviewer, and a reviewer.

20. (currently amended) A computer program product embodied on a computer readable medium for implementing a manuscript review and determination process on a computer, said program comprising instructions for:

receiving manuscript data defining a manuscript including at least one of text data, audio data, and video data;

prompting a potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript;

storing agreement data received from said potential reviewer, said agreement data including at least one of agreement to review and disagreement to review said manuscript; and

storing a decision whether to publish.

21. (previously presented) The computer implemented process according to claim 1, wherein the decision for publishing is a final decision and the manuscript can be published

either in print, or in electronic form.

22. (previously presented) The computer implemented process according to claim 1, further comprising:

correlating the decision for publishing about said manuscript from different potential reviewers and achieving a final decision; and

storing the final decision for publishing in a database.

23. (previously presented) The computer implemented process according to claim 1, further comprising:

tracking said manuscript and storing said tracking information in a database; and

sending a message upon completing a status check that includes whether a set of anticipated events, including receipt of a number of reviewers reviews and editors actions, occurred in a predetermined period of time.

24. (previously presented) The computer implemented process according to claim 22, wherein said final decision for publishing is made by a majority tallying of the individual reviews, if all reviewers indicate said manuscript should be published, said manuscript is automatically sent to a printing queue or printing facility.

25. The process of claim 1 further comprising transmitting a signal prompting an additional potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript if said potential reviewer disagrees to review said manuscript.

26. The process of claim 1 wherein receiving manuscript data comprises receiving at a central computer manuscript data defining a completed manuscript transmitted from a remote terminal associated with an author; and

said prompting a potential reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript comprises transmitting prompt data to a remote terminal associated with said potential reviewer after receiving manuscript data defining a completed manuscript.

27. The process of claim 1 wherein receiving manuscript data comprises receiving at a central computer manuscript data defining a completed manuscript transmitted from a remote

terminal associated with an author; and

in response to receiving said completed manuscript at said central computer automatically prompting a potential reviewer for agreement to review said completed manuscript.

28. The process of claim 1 wherein receiving manuscript data comprises receiving at a central computer manuscript data defining a completed manuscript transmitted from a remote terminal associated with an author; and

in response to receiving at said central computer system a signal indicating that a first potential reviewer disagrees to review said manuscript, generating at said central computer and transmitting to a second potential reviewer at a remote terminal a request prompting said second potential reviewer to review said complete manuscript.

29. The process of claim 1 further comprising storing data indicating an identification of a first associate editor for said manuscript in association with said manuscript data and an identification of an editor, wherein said editor has rights to assign at least one second associate editor for said manuscript and said first associate editor does not have rights to assign any associate editor for said manuscript.

30. The process of claim 1, further comprising:

storing data indicating an identification of a first associate editor for said manuscript in association with said manuscript data;

storing data indicating an identity of an editor;

wherein said associate editor has less rights relating to said manuscript than said editor.

31. (new): A computer implemented manuscript review and determination process, comprising:

receiving at a central computer manuscript data from a remote terminal associated with an author, said manuscript data defining a complete manuscript including at least one of text data, audio data, and video data;

generating at said central computer a request to review prompt for prompting a potential

reviewer for agreement to review said manuscript;

transmitting said request to review prompt to a remote terminal associated with said potential reviewer;

storing in a database controlled by said central computer agreement data received from said potential reviewer at said central computer, said agreement data including at least one of agreement to review and disagreement to review said manuscript; and

storing a decision whether to publish said manuscript.

32. The method of 31 further comprising storing at said central computer different rights relating to a manuscript for users defined as author, editor, associate editor, and reviewer.

33. The method of claim 32 further comprising configuring said central computer wherein a user defined as an author of said manuscript has rights to get status information relating to said manuscript, a user defined as an editor has rights to assign associate editors to said manuscript, assign reviewers to said manuscript, view, authorize publication, and get status information for said manuscript, a user defined as an associate editor for said manuscript has rights to assign reviewers to said manuscript, view, authorize publication, and get status information for said manuscript and does not have rights to assign additional associate editors to said manuscript, a user defined as a reviewer of a manuscript has rights to indicate whether said manuscript should be published, and get status information on said manuscript.

34. The method of claim 31 further comprising storing at said central computer different rights relating to a manuscript for users defined as author editor, associate editor, reviewer, and staff member.